



RUMORS WERE PURE FICTION

Burrows Was Not Outvoted in Senate Committee.

QUORUM WAS NOT PRESENT

SUB-COMMITTEE WILL LIKELY VISIT UTAH.

(Special to The Herald.)
WASHINGTON, Feb. 22.—During the past few days reports have been current that last Saturday's meeting of the privileges and elections committee, was not as harmonious as printed accounts of the proceedings would indicate. Rumors have been in circulation that at the meeting Chairman Burrows was twice overruled by a vote of one against proposition submitted by him for consideration. One of these is said to have been a proposition to reopen the Smoot case in addition to that filed by Attorney Taylor. Another proposition by Burrows, said to have no support excepting his own vote, was a motion to postpone the report in the Smoot case.

Pure Fiction.
In response to an inquiry as to the correctness of these rumors and reports, a member of the committee who attended Saturday's meeting said today: "These reports are pure fiction. There was no quorum of the committee present at Saturday's meeting. The members of the committee who attended were Burrows, Pettus, Hopkins, Dillingham and Overman. In addition to these, McCann came in for a few minutes before the meeting ended. A vote was taken on any proposition, either to postpone the report or reopen the case. In fact, no vote would be needed on the last-named proposition for the case has not been closed and consequently could not be reopened. There was some informal discussion as to making a report on the case, and several senators expressed the opinion that the report should be made at once, but did not indicate what the report should be or whether it should be for or against Smoot. There was some talk also in reference to the Smoot case, but no definite decision in reference to it. In fact, the entire proceeding could be summed up in this: The committee did nothing."

Polygamy Not Charged.

The member of the committee from whom this information was obtained was also questioned concerning the report that Chairman Burrows has received an offer of testimony from A. L. Morris which would fasten the crime of polygamy on Smoot, and said in response that so far as the members of the committee were informed no charge of polygamy against Smoot personally had been given credit. There is much speculation as to the future procedure of the committee in dealing with the Smoot case, and the general consensus of opinion seems to be that a sub-committee will visit Utah during the coming summer for the purpose of obtaining further testimony.

REQUISITION FOR THE SLAYERS OF MIDDAGH

(Special to The Herald.)
CHICAGO, Feb. 22.—Governor Brooks today issued a requisition on the governor of Utah for Dave Praughton and A. L. Caldwell, charged with the murder of J. O. Middagh, cashier of the Cody National Bank, during the recent riot at Salt Lake with the papers tonight. Praughton and Caldwell, who were wanted in this state for holding up the Jensen saloon at Fort Steele last month and murdering a Mexican named Valdez.

DID NOT ASSUME TO SPEAK FOR ROOSEVELT

Washington, Feb. 22.—Senator Elkins, chairman of the committee on interstate commerce, desires to correct a report of what occurred in the executive session of the committee yesterday, especially in reference to what he was quoted as saying regarding the position of the president. He told the committee that the announcement had been made at the White House that the president expected the railroad rate question could not be acted upon at this session, but he did not assume to speak for the president on any matter connected with legislation or say the president was not satisfied with the bill passed by the house.

WANTED THE TRUTH.

Redmond Created a Commotion in the House of Commons.

London, Feb. 22.—A lively scene at question time in the house of commons today arose from the affair of Sir Antony MacDonnell, under secretary to the lord lieutenant of Ireland. The nationalists were heckling Premier Balfour and Mr. Wyndham, chief secretary for Ireland, in an effort to extract further information as to how far Mr. Wyndham was involved in what he has termed the under secretary's "defensible" course connected with the revolution scheme, when John Redmond, the Irish leader, turning to Mr. Wyndham, shouted:

"You might as well tell the truth at once."

Mr. Balfour immediately raised a point of order, the speaker ruled that the remark was "unparliamentary," and Mr. Redmond promptly apologized and explained that he had not meant to imply that untruths had been told, but that the whole truth had not been told, and that he did not want to be obliged to drag it out piece-meal.

Mr. Redmond ultimately secured an adjournment of the house to call attention to Sir Antony MacDonnell's position.

ENTERS INTO MATRIMONY

George White, Former Resident of Salt Lake, Marries at Portland, Ore.

George White, a former well known resident of Salt Lake, was married yesterday to Henrietta Diana Fletcher at Portland, Ore. in St. Stephen's Episcopal church in that city. They are now on a bridal tour to the west.

The bridegroom was employed for a couple of years as a reporter on the Tribune. He left Salt Lake two years ago and went to Portland, where he is on the staff of the Oregonian.

RAILED FROM THE OPERATION

Dr. William R. Harper Under the Surgeon's Knife.

AFFLICTED WITH CANCER

LITTLE CHANCE FOR PERMANENT RECOVERY.

CHICAGO, Feb. 22.—While at the University of Chicago, hundreds of students were assembled to participate in prayers for his recovery, Dr. William R. Harper, president of the institution, this afternoon underwent serious surgical operation in the Presbyterian hospital. For nearly two years Dr. Harper has been afflicted with severe pains in the abdomen, and about a year ago underwent an operation for appendicitis. This did not result in permanent improvement, and it was finally decided, after exhaustive examination by his physicians, that a second operation was necessary.



Dr. William R. Harper.

It was generally thought by the physicians that it would reveal a cancerous condition of the intestines near the head of the colon. This diagnosis was confirmed by the operation this afternoon.

Operation a Success.

The operation on a surgical stand-point was a success. The patient rallied splendidly from the shock, and is tonight in a condition that gives every promise of an early recovery from the effects of the operation. The ultimate result of the operation is a matter on which the physicians decline to comment themselves but merely express "the reasonable hope that the disease may be checked."

It was found that Dr. Harper was afflicted with carcinoma of the posterior end of the colon, and the disease had progressed so far that it was found impossible to remove all of the diseased tissue.

Diagnosis Was Correct.

After the conclusion of the operation Dr. Senn of Chicago, who was one of the attending physicians, made the direct declaration that Dr. Harper was afflicted with cancer, while a bulletin issued by Dr. Billings said that Dr. McCann and Bevan were of the opinion that the trouble was cancer. Dr. Billings himself would express no opinion.

Late tonight Dr. Harper had fallen into a comfortable sleep and was in excellent condition so far as the immediate result of the operation was concerned. No apprehension was expressed as to his rapid recovery from the operation. It would be the opinion of the attending physicians that the operation was performed by Dr. McCann, Bevan, and Hektoen.

Tissue Not All Removed.

Dr. Harper was under the influence of the anesthetic during the operation, although the operation itself did not consume over twenty-five minutes. After the operation the diseased tissue was made by the physicians, and it was concluded that, although all of the diseased tissue had not been removed, it was not necessary to continue the operation further. The operation was performed by Dr. McCann, Bevan, and Hektoen.

Physicians' Bulletin.

"The operation was performed by Dr. McCann, Bevan, and Hektoen, and completed at 3:30 o'clock. A complete incision was made in the posterior wall of the head of the colon and enlargement of the glands of the mesentery was found. The entire removal of the diseased tissue was deemed impossible by the surgeons and the wound was closed. It was the opinion of the attending physicians that the disease is carcinoma. It has been decided that President Harper shall be kept upon medical and X-ray treatment, with the reasonable hope that the disease may be checked. It is anticipated that Dr. Harper will make a speedy convalescence."

A late bulletin was promised by Drs. Billings and Bevan at 8:15, but at 10 o'clock it had not been issued, and there was no indication of the time when it would be forthcoming. However this did not indicate any change in the condition of the patient.

Midnight Bulletin.

Shortly after midnight Dr. Billings issued the following bulletin: "At 11:30 o'clock Dr. Harper is resting easily. His pulse is 72, his respiration is normal. His breathing is natural. (Signed) 'DR. FRANK BILLINGS.'"

Dr. Billings said that after coming out of the influence of the anesthetic, Dr. Harper had been sleeping easily. The operation had been successful, he said, and apparently the patient will have a speedy convalescence.

"Of course we can tell much better in the morning," said Dr. Billings, "but we have every reason to believe Dr. Harper's recovery, so far as the operation is concerned, will be rapid."

GUilty OF MANSLAUGHTER.

Boise, Ida., Feb. 22.—At 1:30 this morning the jury returned a verdict of manslaughter in the case of Jennie Daly. She is the widow of Charles Daly, for whose murder William Henry Hicks-Brown was convicted last week by her own confession was privy to her husband's killing, and rented a pistol with which to do the shooting.

QUESTIONS FOR MR. HITCHCOCK

Text of Two Resolutions Introduced in the House.

OIL LEASE STILL BOTHERS

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 22.—Another chapter in the Osage oil lease incident developed today when Representative Stevens of Texas introduced two resolutions in the house addressing inquiries to the secretary of the interior regarding the Foster lease of the oil and gas lands belonging to the Osage Indians. One resolution calls on the secretary to furnish the house with a copy of the Foster lease and of all sub-leases under that parent lease, giving the dates of the approval or rejection and all correspondence on the subject. The other resolution asks under what act of congress the Foster lease was made, and under what authority of law the sub-leases were approved. The secretary is asked whether he did not ratify the Foster lease to the Alameda company and whether this was not the first sub-lease so ratified, and whether he had not previously refused to ratify sub-leases.

Relative to the Company.

The resolution asks not only for the date of the ratification of the Alameda sub-lease, but also calls for a list of the officers, directors and stockholders of the Alameda company, with information as to whether any of these persons are "personally known or in any way related to him (the secretary) and if so, the name of such person and how related."

The resolution directs the secretary to state whether he did or not on Feb. 13 last, in a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee on Indian affairs, write that there is no necessity for the proposed legislation in order to protect the existing rights of the Osage Indians, and that the Foster lease and it is not deemed advisable, nor, indeed, would it be just, to renew and extend the said lease for a period of ten years or any other period, without the knowledge and consent of the Indians.

Pointed Question.

The resolution continues: "And if you did write this letter, please state to this house what information you have since received that has caused you to recommend the adoption of the resolution, and to the Indian appropriation bill extending said lease for ten years on 680,000 acres of land in the Osage reservation, and securing the consent of said Indians."

The statement recently given out by Secretary Hitchcock in which he said that "the original Foster lease was an unheard of monopoly and nothing short of a public scandal," and the resolution asks the secretary if he was truly correctly quoted and if so to state why he now recommends extension of the lease.

TRIAL OF BOODLER KRATZ

Thomas K. Niedringhaus Summoned as a Witness by the Defense.

BUTLER, Mo., Feb. 22.—Shortly after entering the courtroom today, where he is on trial on the charge of receiving a bribe while a member of the St. Louis municipal assembly, Charles Kratz, who is charged with the murder of a man, was summoned to assist him into Judge Denton's private room, where he lost consciousness. Kratz was taken to a hospital, and a physician was summoned. Kratz has been ill for several months, and recently underwent an operation from which he has not entirely recovered.

The trial was delayed for more than half-hour before Kratz again entered the courtroom. He was looking pale and trembled noticeably as he walked to his seat.

Charles T. Gutke, a former member of the St. Louis house of delegates, testified that he went with Kratz to the courtroom, and that he saw Kratz in a state of collapse. He asked him to handle the urban bill in the house, but that he (Gutke) said he could not, as there was a combine of men in the house, and that he could not act for all of them without consulting them.

William Desmond, chief of detectives of St. Louis, was the last witness for the state. He described his trip to Mexico when Kratz was brought back to St. Louis under the provisions of a special treaty.

On the request of Attorney Faunt LeRoy, counsel for the defense, a writ of attachment was issued today for Thomas K. Niedringhaus to attend as a witness.

BRYAN ADDRESSES KANSAS DEMOCRATS

Topeka, Kan., Feb. 22.—W. J. Bryan addressed the Kansas Democrats tonight on "Back to the People."

The occasion was a Washington birthday banquet given by the Kansas Democratic club, and the speaker was warmly received. Bryan said that the purpose of the Democratic party in the state was to elect a vigorous campaign for the office of governor, and that he was confident that the party would be victorious.

BANQUET AT LOS ANGELES

C. O. Whittemore, Fisher Harris and ex-Governor Wells Among the Guests.

Los Angeles, Feb. 22.—Washington's birthday was celebrated at the sixteenth annual banquet of the Los Angeles chamber of commerce tonight at Turner hall. It was one of the most elaborate functions of the kind ever given in Los Angeles.

Plates were laid for 450 guests. H. McVey presided at the banquet, and the principal speakers and their toasts were: Senator-elect Frank P. Flint, "Good Citizenship"; President J. R. Poole, "George Washington"; C. O. Whittemore of Salt Lake, general counsel of the Salt Lake railroad, "Salt Lake and City by the Sea"; and Edwin H. Hart of Berkeley, California.

There were a number of prominent residents of Salt Lake present, having come through on a train over the Salt Lake railroad, arriving here this morning. Among them were L. H. Farnsworth, P. S. Harris and former Governor Wells of Utah. The hall was beautifully decorated with flowers, palms and the national colors.



SUBPOENAS ARE BEING SERVED

Deputy Marshals Active at the Packing Centers.

MOODY MEANS BUSINESS

GARFIELD'S REPORT IS ALMOST READY.

CHICAGO, Feb. 22.—Work toward possible indictments of leaders of the great packing interests kept the offices of the United States attorney busy today, in spite of the holiday. Deputy marshals were serving subpoenas on several of the men who would not be found yesterday, mostly clerks and department managers.

ST. PAUL, Minn., Feb. 22.—It was learned today that Parker A. Jacobson, local manager for the Armour Packing company, and John A. Bangs, manager for the Swift Packing company, have been served with subpoenas to appear before the grand jury in Chicago, April 24, to testify in the beef trust investigation. The serving of the subpoenas was a complete surprise to all concerned.

It is also said that secret service men have been engaged for three weeks in collecting evidence concerning the workings of the beef trust in the northwest, which will be of great value in furthering the purposes of the grand jury inquiry.

EVIDENCE COLLECTED.

Government Feels That Prosecution Is Justified.

Washington, Feb. 22.—Commissioner Garfield of the bureau of corporations has not yet completed his report of the investigation of the beef trust. Five important chapters of the report practically have been finished, but the detailed figures for the remainder have not been obtained. Inspectors of the bureau are now working on this part of the report, and it is expected that the information will be in the hands of Commissioner Garfield next week.

It is not certain whether that part of the report which has been completed will be submitted to the president by congress at the present session. The reasons why all the information obtained should not be made public at this time, but it is possible that it may be sent to congress before adjournment. Under the law it is discretionary with the president whether the reports submitted to him by the commissioner of corporations shall be made public in their entirety.

In directing that the operations of the beef trust be investigated by a special federal grand jury Attorney General Moody has acted upon facts developed by the investigation conducted by Commissioner Garfield. This information was presented by the department of justice through the present.

It is not desired by officials of the government to publish at this time the concrete results of the inquiry, because by so doing the hand of the government in any prosecution of the operators in the trust would be disclosed, in a measure, at least.

Commissioner Garfield and a corps of clerks in his bureau are at work today on the report notwithstanding the fact that the department is closed. Every effort is being made to expedite this, not only in order to lay the report before the president, but also to leave the way clear for his inquiry into the operations of the oil trust. The latter inquiry will be begun actively next week. Commissioner Garfield now being engaged in preparing his plans for it and outlining the work to be done.

KILLED HIMSELF.

San Francisco, Feb. 22.—Ira Bishop, formerly a millionaire steel bar, who had lived here for many years, was found dead in Golden Gate park today, under circumstances indicating suicide. He was over 60 years of age and had been very despondent on account of financial reverses.

CARRINGTON TRIED BY CIVIL COURT

Army Officer Sentenced to Prison For 40 Years in the Philippines Has Good Excuse to Appeal Under the Law.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 22.—Major General Corbin, commanding the Philippine division, cables the war department today a confirmation of the press report of the conviction of Major Carrington at Manila, and stating that the sentence was for forty years. General Corbin says:

"Major Carrington, convicted by the court of first instance of all counts against him, was sentenced to forty years in the Billard prison. Appealed to supreme court."

As the convicted officer is now in his fiftieth year this action of the court is practically amounts to the imposition of a life sentence. The result was obtained by the application of the Spanish law permitting cumulative sentences, which is not common in our own civil or military law.

Major Carrington's conviction raises some exceedingly interesting legal questions. One of these, upon which it is possible his case may be carried to the supreme court of the United States, is the constitutional question of the right of a civil court in the Philippines to separate a United States military officer from his governmental service on account of an overt act alleged to have been committed by him, in the discharge of his duty, to his own government. The question of the court's right to try an American citizen is also involved. Meanwhile, the army itself does not know what to do in Carrington's case, as it is a problem how he can be separated from the military service, not having been convicted by a court-martial, as the law requires, and condition precedent, or being a deserter. It has been suggested that this may be done by nominating and confirming his successor as a major in the United States army, but present indications are that no action will be taken by the military authorities in that direction pending the disposition of Carrington's appeal to the higher courts.

WEBER FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER

Jury Out 15 Hours Deliberating on the Case of the Young California Fiend Who Killed Father, Mother, Sister and Brother.

UBURN, Cal., Feb. 22.—Adolph Weber was today convicted of murder in the first degree, for the killing of his mother. The jury was out fifteen hours.

Adolph Weber, who is only 20 years old, was tried for the murder of his mother, but he also was charged with killing his father, sister and brother and of burning the family residence. The tragedy occurred Nov. 19, 1904, at Auburn, where the family lived. On that day, soon after Adolph left his home it was destroyed by fire and the other four members of the family perished. An examination of the family taken from the ruins of the house proved that the mother, father and daughter had been shot, while the dead boy had been struck on the head with some blunt instrument.

Adolph arrived at the fire before it was extinguished and threw into the flames a bundle containing his bloodstained trousers which a few minutes before he had exchanged for a new pair. This and other circumstances led to his arrest. He is the sole heir to the estate, which is quite valuable. Eminent counsel were retained for his defense while the attorney general of the state conducted the prosecution. The trial occupied twenty-eight days, during which the jury maintained his composure to a remarkable degree.

PORTO RICANS WILL BE BROUGHT OVER TO TAKE PART IN INAUGURAL PARADE

Washington, Feb. 22.—The Porto Rican battalion of infantry, which has been ordered to take part in the inaugural ceremonies, will make the trip from San Juan to this city and back on the steamer Arcadia, which has been chartered by the war department for that purpose. The battalion will number 235 men, and will be quartered in the city during their stay in this city.

The plan of having two warships in this harbor on inauguration day has been abandoned and the auxiliary cruiser Prairie will be the naval vessel to be sent here on that occasion. Owing to her great draft the Prairie will anchor off Alexandria. She was formerly a trans-Atlantic liner, and has a displacement of nearly 7,000 tons.

BUNCO MEN ROUNDED UP BY RENO POLICE

RENO, Nev., Feb. 22.—Chief of Police Leeper and his officers this afternoon unearthed an organized band of bunco men. Several arrests have already been made and more will follow. The men in custody have given assumed names and are thought to be from California and Nevada. A statement was made today that the band had been operating in Reno for several days and had been engaged in fleecing the unruly. Short change, marked cards and brace games have been the methods used. The headquarters of the

MAKES RECLUSES STREET CAR MEN ARE HE'D UP

Forecast of Report of the North Sea Commission.

BRITISH ARE INDIGNANT

BITTER COMMENT IN THE LONDON PAPERS.

PARIS, Feb. 22.—A semi-official statement appeared tonight relative to the work of the international commission which has been considering the North Sea incident. It is as follows: "The Hull commission met this morning in the ministry of foreign affairs and again this afternoon in order to proceed to a final examination of the report recapitulating its conclusions. The report is rather long, comprising about ten large pages. The principal author is Admiral von Spaun (Austrian), but all the members of the commission have taken part in drawing it up. The commission gives no opinion on the question of the presence or absence of Japanese torpedo boats in the North Sea, declaring merely that the Russian admiral quite legitimately believed that his squadron was endangered and that he had the right under the circumstances to act as he did. The commission's reference to the Russian government's engagement to indemnify the victims of the depredations incident is liable to modification at the instance of one or other of the governments, the commission's decision being without appeal, the commissioners do not wish to appear interested in simply learning through the press of the last public sitting and the conclusions arrived at. There is nothing in this preliminary communication or report except an act of deference."

The public sitting for the reading of the conclusions will probably be held on Saturday. Members of the commission who were seen tonight refused to either confirm or deny the statement, but officials having favorable opportunities to judge of the results of the inquiry consider the statement to be substantially correct.

BRITISH DISAPPOINTED.

London Newspapers Swell the Chorus of Indignation.

London, Feb. 22.—A strong chord of indignation has been struck in the London daily newspapers this morning over the semi-official statement relative to the decision of the North Sea commission. The officials of the newspapers still hoped that the publication of the full text of the commission's report may modify the impression produced by the preliminary statement, but it is one of intense disappointment.

The Daily Mail goes so far as to declare it has dealt a death blow to arbitration. Some of the newspapers blame the government strongly for ever consenting to subject such a matter to arbitration, while some of the conservative papers are more moderate in their criticism. The latter in the fact that the country by doing so avoided war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent.

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."

The Morning Post says: "A new dogma of international law is thus established, under which the commander of a belligerent fleet may lawfully destroy neutral unarmed vessels which avoid war with Russia. No question is raised as to the Russian admiral's respect, and Great Britain's share of the heavy costs will be cheerfully paid, but it is considered that the decision leaves the question of a neutral's rights on the sea in a deplorably unsatisfactory state, and creates a dangerous precedent."